UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,992	02/13/2002	William A. Burris	1111 008 301 0252	6883
37211 BASCH & NIC	7590 11/30/201 KERSON LLP	EXAMINER		
1777 PENFIELD ROAD			CONLEY, SEAN EVERETT	
PENFIELD, NY 14526			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/30/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dneels@bnpatentlaw.com dmasters@bnpatentlaw.com mnickerson@bnpatentlaw.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/074,992	BURRIS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SEAN E. CONLEY	1775	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following periods:	or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is lat no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHII TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	N
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	n fee (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the da	te of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. S a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues f appeal; and/or	or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324)	).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelin non-allowable claim(s).	g the
7. 🛮 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🗌 will not be entered, or b) 🗷 will be entered and an explanation	of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5,7-18,20-31,33 and 34</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entere because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provid showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	e a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because See Continuation Sheet.	e:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
13.  Other:	
/SEAN E CONLEY/	
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1775	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. Concerning the finality of the office action, the Examiner disagrees with the argument that it is premature. The claim amendment "when the device is operating" overcame the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of the non-final office action but also changed the scope of the claim. The change in scope of the claims necessiated the new grounds of rejection and the opened the door to the possibility of applying new prior art as well as any prior art previously cited that may still apply. The new grounds of rejection cited by the Examiner addresses this new claim limitation. The new limitation is a functional limitation that is capable of being performed by the combination of Contreras and Burris as stated in the final rejection. The Applicant's remaining arguments are directed to the functions of the device and not the structural differences between the device and the prior art. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5, 7-18, 20-31, 33 and 34 remain rejected for the reasons set forth in the final office action.

/SEC/